DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 195 209 HE 013 316

AUTHOR Wilson, Richard F.: Miller, James L., Jr.
TITLE Private College Participation in Planning and Program Review Activities of Forty-Five State-Level Higher Education Agencies.
INSTITUTION Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
PUB DATE Jun 80
NOTE 68p.
AVAILABLE FROM Center for the Study of Higher Education, School of Education, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Curriculum: College Planning: *Curriculum Evaluation: Government School Relationship: Higher Education: Long Range Planning: National Surveys: Participation: *Private Colleges: *Program Evaluation: *State Boards of Education: *State Colleges: *Statewide Planning

ABSTRACT

The long-range planning and program review policies and practices of state-level higher education agencies and the extent and kind of private college participation in these processes were investigated. A survey was administered by telephone to the executive directors of 45 state-level higher education agencies, to the executive directors of 37 private college state associations, and to eight private college presidents. Findings indicated that operating relationships with private colleges had been developed by a substantial number of state agencies in the areas of long-range planning and public college new program review. Private college participation was identified in approximately half of the states for both activities. Participation methods varied but formative approaches were in the majority for long-range planning while reactive strategies were utilized to a greater extent in public college new program reviews. Private college participation in the review of existing programs in public colleges was occurring in a relatively small number of states. A substantial number of the state agencies were conducting such reviews (34 of 45), but private colleges were formally involved in only eight instances. Public institutions were concerned that private colleges were frequently asked to help review public college programs without reciprocal opportunities being extended to public colleges. Information is presented on methods used to secure private college participation in state agency planning and reviews. A bibliography is included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED195209

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Center for the Study of Higher Education
University of Michigan
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Private College Participation in Planning and Program Review Activities of Forty-Five State-Level Higher Education Agencies

by

Richard F. Wilson

and

James L. Miller, Jr.

HE013 316

Center for the Study of Higher Education
School of Education
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

June, 1980

School of Education
Center for the Study of Higher Education

Joan S. Stark, Dean

Marvin W. Peterson, Director

Faculty

Robert T. Blackburn
Joseph P. Cosand
Zelda Gamson
Gerald Gurin
Murray Jackson
James L. Miller, Jr.

Copyright 1980 by The Regents of The University of Michigan
(Center for the Study of Higher Education)
Ann Arbor, Michigan. All rights reserved.

PREFACE

This report is based on a study of the long range planning and program review relationships of state-level higher education agencies and private colleges in 45 states. The study was conducted in 1976 at the University of Michigan's Center for the Study of Higher Education. Presented here are results of that study with specific attention to: 1) identifying the extent and types of private college participation in state agency, long-range planning and program reviews; 2) evaluating selected aspects of these relationships; and 3) explaining the patterns that emerged.

Most recent research on private college relationships with the states has focused nearly exclusively on financial support programs. Readers accustomed to this thrust should be alerted that this report ignores these financial relationships, about which much has been written, in favor of planning and program review relationships, about which little is known.

The Lilly Endowment, Inc. provided financial support for this study and for distribution of this report to the survey participants. The authors gratefully acknowledge the Endowment's interest and commitment to this research effort.

Portions of this monograph have been accepted for publication by the Journal of Higher Education entitled, "Institutional Participation and Reciprocity in State-Level Program Review" (in press), Ohio State University Press, Columbus, Ohio.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	Preface	iii
	List of Tables	vii
I.	THE EMERGING STATE PLANNING INTEREST IN PRIVATE COLLEGES	1
II.	CLASSIFICATION OF PRIVATE COLLEGE PARTICIPATION STRATEGIES	5
III.	PRIVATE COLLEGE PARTICIPATION IN STATE AGENCY LONG RANGE PLANNING	10
IV.	PRIVATE COLLEGE PARTICIPATION IN STATE AGENCY PROGRAM REVIEW ACTIVITIES	16
V.	EXPLAINING STATE VARIATIONS IN PRIVATE COLLEGE PARTICIPATION	23
VI.	CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS	33
	APPENDICES	39
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	57

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Title	Page
1	1202 Commission Designation	4
2	Methods Used to Secure Private College Participation in State Agency Long Range Planning and Program Reviews	7
3	Classification of Approaches to Private College Participation in State Agency Long Range Planning and Program Review	8
4	State Agency Authority and Practice in Long Range Planning	11
5	Satisfaction With Procedure Used to Secure Private College Participation in Long Range Planning	13
6	Satisfaction With the Private College Contribution to the Development of a Recent Long Range Plan	14
7	Satisfaction With the Completed Plan	15
8	State Agency Authority and Practices Concerning the Review of Public and Private College Programs	17
9	Classification of the Kind of Private College Participation in the Program Review Activities of State Level Higher Education Agencies	17
10	Satisfaction With the Proceedure Used to Involve Private Colleges in State Agency Reviews of Public College New Program Proposals	22
11	Patterns of Private College Involvement in Long Range Planning and Program Review Activities of State Level Agencies	24, 25

Table	Title	Page
12	The Relationship Between Selected Structural Characteristics of the State and Private College Involvement in State Agency Long Range Planning and Program Review Activities	27
13	The Relationship Between Selected Indicators of Private College Presence in Each State and the Involvement of Private Colleges in State Agency Long Range Planning and Program Review Activities	29
14	The Relationship Between Selected Indicators of State Wealth and Commitment to Higher Education and the Involvement of Private Colleges in State Agency Long Range Planning and Program Review Activities	30
15	The Relationship Between Types of State Aid to the Private Sector and Private College Involvement in State Agency Long Range Planning and Program Review Activities	31
16	Summary of State Agency and Private College Interaction in Recent Long Range Planning and Program Review Activities	34

I. THE EMERGING STATE PLANNING INTEREST IN PRIVATE COLLEGES

The involvement of private colleges and universities in state-level planning for postsecondary education is a much debated issue that has been satisfactorily resolved in only a few states. A number of problems must be faced in trying to establish this relationship, not the least of which is the value placed on keeping the private sector relatively free from government intervention and interference. This value is especially difficult to reconcile with state planning responsibilities for public institutions, which in most states are vested in state-level higher education agencies.[1] These agencies have emerged in almost every state in the last decade and usually have been created to deal with matters relating to public higher education; in only a few instances have operating relationships been established with private colleges and universities. This situation is changing and state agencies increasingly are finding it necessary to establish more formal relationships with private colleges in order to sustain and better utilize the contributions of that sector. There is a growing appreciation of the importance of programs which private institutions make available in the states and an awareness of the vulnerability of these programs where the public sector expands as though the private sector does not exist. However, the development of policies and procedures to involve private institutions in state-level planning and program review activities which avoid inappropriate types of state control over private institutions have proven difficult to arrange.

There is scattered evidence to be discussed later that successful planning and program review relationships between the states and private higher education are emerging. A pressing need is for a

---

1. This term has been shortened to state agencies or state boards throughout this monograph and refers to those agencies which have a statutory or constitutional mandate to coordinate (and in some cases govern) all public higher or postsecondary education. These agencies exist in 48 of the 50 states but vary in terms of specific authority: a) eight states have an advisory board; b) 21 states have a regulatory board, and c) 19 states have a governing board. For further discussion of these agency types see Berdahl, 1977: 18-36 and Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1976: 90.

description of these relationships, an assessment of how they are working, and an analysis of the factors contributing to their development. This research has addressed itself to these concerns. This information was collected to enable institutional and state-level decision makers to make informed choices about the best way for the private sector and the state to relate to one another for planning and program review purposes.

The remainder of this chapter will be devoted to identifying some important reasons for the growing state interest in private higher education, particularly as this interest is reflected in the activities of state-level higher education agencies. In Chapter II the classification scheme used to study the operating relationships between state-level agencies and private institutions is discussed. This scheme forms the basis in Chapters III and IV for presenting findings on the extent of private college participation in state-level planning and program review. Chapter V offers an analysis of why the relationships have developed in the way that they have, and Chapter VI discusses the policy implications of these relationships.

Supporting Positions

The Carnegie Commission in its report, The Capitol and the Campus, indicated that "...our present capacity to examine fully the state's relationships to the totality of postsecondary education is restricted by past failures to view it as a totality and by tendendies to omit private institutions from state concern" (1971:9). As part of several recommendations the Commission suggested that state boards should take into account the contributions of private higher education.

In 1973 a Task Force on Coordination, Governance, and Structure of Postsecondary Education, sponsored by the Education Commission of the States, issued a report stating, among other things, that "...the state has a responsibility to take nonpublic institutions into account in its planning efforts and in any consideration of postsecondary educational resources in the state" (1973:91). At the same time the Task Force indicated, "The method of articulation and cooperation of the state postsecondary agency with non-public institutions is complex and is still in the process of evolving" (1973:91). This point is particularly relevant to this study.

A task force of the National Council on Independent Colleges and Universities followed some of the same lines of reasoning in reporting:

> A rational system of higher education, including public and private sectors, can only be obtained by

> careful planning. State educational planning agencies should take into account the presence of private institutions, consult with them, when feasible make contracts with them for needed services, and otherwise avoid unnecessary duplication and wasteful competition. Private institutions should cooperate in statewide planning, but the actions of state planning agencies should respect the autonomy of both public and private institutions. (1974:6-7).

In an attempt to resolve some of the problems surrounding both state support of private higher education and the whole general area of the states' relationship to the private sector, the Education Commission of the States convened a Task Force on State Policy and Independent Higher Education in 1976. The report of the Task Force did not attempt to prescribe a single solution but rather to provide a framework for addressing the problems. This framework involved consideration of the policy objectives for postsecondary education in each state, the role to be played by the private sector, and the current condition of the private institutions. The Task Force suggested that, once these questions had been addressed, a state policy with respect to private colleges and universities could be developed and used as the basis for implementing operating relationships (Education Commission on the States, 1977).

The Relationships Develop

In spite of many problems there is evidence that the states are making progress in identifying optimal ways to relate to private colleges. For purposes of this research, those studies and reports dealing specifically with planning and program review relationships are particularly important.

Chronister (1978) looked at private college relationships to state planning agencies with specific attention to the nature of plans conducted, the provisions for including the private sector, and the mechanisms utilized. By design, Chronister's survey population was not exclusively state-level, higher education agencies but instead included the state agency designated to conduct higher education planning. As Table 1 indicates, this planning responsibility belongs to the state-level higher education agency (with regular or augmented membership) in 30 states but is assigned to some other agency or has not been assigned in 20 states. Chronister's study was focused at the state level in general instead of on state-level higher education agencies in particular. Chronister's research overlaps some of the concerns of this study and was quite helpful in formulating initial survey questions.

TABLE 1

1202 Commission Designation

Number of states in which the 1202 Commission:	
is the statewide higher education agency	18
is the statewide higher education agency with augmented membership	12
is a separately designated agency	14
does not exist	6
Total	50

Several recent studies have dealt with the issues involved and the procedures to be followed in conducting state-level program reviews (Barak and Berdahl, 1978; Johnson, 1975; Mingle, 1978; and Southern Regional Education Board, 1977). These studies are quite helpful in sorting out state agency and public institution relationships in program review but give little attention to the role of private colleges in such processes.

The need for information on the private sector role in state agency, long range planning and program review is addressed through this research. The focus is on documenting the experience among the states, assessing satisfaction with procedures and outcomes, and explaining the variations that exist.

II. CLASSIFICATION OF PRIVATE COLLEGE PARTICIPATION STRATEGIES

One objective for this study involved securing descriptive and evaluative information about the long-range planning and program review policies and practices of every state-level higher education agency. A survey was designed to collect information for: (1) the planning and program review authority and practices of each agency; (2) the extent and kind of private college participation in planning and program review processes; and (3) the state agency and private college satisfaction with planning and program review procedures and outcomes. The executive directors of the state-level higher education agencies and the executive directors of the private college associations in each state were designated as the survey population.

Survey Population

Forty-five states were studied. Five states were not included for the following reasons: 1) Vermont and Delaware operated without a state-level higher education agency; 2) Wyoming had no private colleges; 3) Nevada had only one private institution; and 4) Alaska lost its last four-year private institution just as the survey was about to begin.

Private college state associations existed in 37 of the 45 states. These state associations exist primarily to represent private college interests before the legislative and the executive branches of Government.[2] For the remaining eight states at least one private college president was selected to participate in the study in lieu of a private college association director.

The survey was administered by telephone to the executive directors of the 45 state-level higher education agencies, to the executive directors of 37 private college state associations, and to eight private college presidents. It was assumed that these individuals had the perspective needed to respond to the questions

---

2. These private college state associations should not be confused with a second type of voluntary organization of private colleges that exist in many states and that coordinates mutually beneficial fund-raising activities, for example, in making appeals to the business community for general support of private higher education. The executive directors of these fund raising organizations were not included as survey participants because their role is not oriented toward planning and program review activities of statewide higher education agencies.

being investigated or could designate a more appropriate survey participant. Sixty-nine of the 90 interviews were held with the agency or institutional chief executive officer; in 21 instances the interview was with a designate. A list of all survey participants can be found in Appendix A.

Participation Methods

As one part of the survey respondents were asked to identify the specific methods used to secure private college participation in long-range planning and program review activities. The methods were analyzed and found to vary in two important ways. One difference was permanence: some methods were invoked to meet reoccurring needs in a continuing way which were termed standing methods and some were created for a relatively short period of time to meet special needs which were termed ad hoc methods. The methods also varied in the nature of private participation with some offering only the opportunity to comment or react, essentially a consultative role, while others afforded a more substantive role in decision making.

These four characteristics, the standing or ad hoc nature of the participation and the consultative or substantive type of participation, were combined to form four broad categories into which all private college participation methods could be grouped. The participation categories and methods are presented in Table 2.

The first category consists of ad hoc-consultative methods which provided an opportunity for private college questions, comments, and concerns to be registered through a means not requiring a formal and continuing relationship with the agency. These methods provided only limited participation in planning and program review decision making.

Standing-consultative methods comprise the second category and are distinguished by the formally recognized and continuing advisory role that these methods provided private colleges. Utilization of methods in this category gave more formal and/or procedural assurance than was found with ad hoc-consultative methods that private college concerns would be registered.

The ad hoc-substantive methods, the third category, were created by the state agency to provide private colleges with substantive involvement in a particular activity and thus were not permanent forms of participation. However, these methods provided more opportunity for participants to be involved in decision-making processes, particularly with respect to design and development issues, than was true for either of the first two categories.

TABLE 2

Methods Used to Secure Private College Participation in State Agency Long Range Planning and Program Reviews

Ad Hoc-Consultative
1. Respond to Draft Documents or Proposals
2. Provide Data and Information Upon Request
3. Testify at Public Hearings or Board Meetings
4. Informal Contact with Staff Members
Standing-Consultative
1. Membership on Advisory Committee of Private College Representatives (Presidents, Faculty, etc.)
2. Membership on General Advisory Committee to Agency
3. Membership on Voluntary State Association of Public and Private Colleges
4. 1202 Commission Membership
Ad Hoc-Substantive
1. Membership on Advisory Groups, Task Forces, or Review Teams Responsible for Developing a Plan or Conducting Program Reviews
2. Plan or Review Coordinating Group Membership
3. Designated as Consultants or Staff Associates
4. Membership on Regional Planning Council
Standing-Substantive
1. Agency Board Membership

The fourth category, standing-substantive, includes only one method, that of voting membership on the agency board. This procedure for securing private college participation was distinctive in that it provided private colleges with a continuing decision making role in all matters undertaken by the agency.

TABLE 3

Classification of Approaches to Private College Participation in State Agency Long Range Planning and Program Review

Participation Classification	Combination of Methods Used[a]	Access to Planning and Program Review Decision Making	
		Extent	Stage(s) Usually Involved
Reactive	1	Limited	Development
Advisory	1 & 2; 2	Moderate	Design, Development, and Adoption
Formative	1 & 2 & 3; 1 & 3; 2 & 3; 3	Extensive	Design, Development, and Adoption
Voting	1 & 4; 1 & 2 & 4; 1 & 3 & 4; 2 & 3 & 4	Extensive	Issue Identification, Adoption, Implementation, and Monitoring

[a]The numbers in this column represent the type (1 = ad hoc-consultative; 2 = standing-consultative; 3 = ad hoc-substantive; and 4 = standing-substantive) and combinations of methods used to secure private college participation.

Participation Classification

The methods listed in Table 2 were used in many combinations and thus provided private colleges with varying roles in decision making. In analyzing the combinations used, private college participation was classified as either reactive, advisory, formative, or voting. These classifications are presented in Table 3 and discussed briefly below:

The reactive classification pertained whenever only ad hoc-consultative methods were used, thus affording private colleges very limited access to decision making.

The advisory classification resulted whenever standing-consultative methods were used alone or in combination with ad hoc-consultative methods. This participation strategy provided private colleges somewhat greater access to decision making, primarily as a result of the more formalized nature of the advisory methods. Such influence usually extended to more stages of planning and program review processes than was the case for reactive approaches.

The formative classification resulted whenever ad hoc-substantive methods were used, either alone or in combination with ad hoc and/or standing-consultative methods. This classification seemed to facilitate extensive access to operational decisions in design and development stages and in presenting results for adoption by the agency.

The voting classification occurred whenever private colleges had board membership. This group was separated for special consideration because of the uniqueness of the strategy.

This classification scheme was used both to portray and analyze private college participation in state agency long range planning and program review. Findings are presented in the next three chapters.

III. PRIVATE COLLEGE PARTICIPATION IN STATE AGENCY LONG RANGE PLANNING

Initial survey attention was diverted to identify which state agencies had undertaken a long-range planning effort with private college involvement in the preceding five years. As Table 4 indicates, such planning had occurred in 24 of the 45 state agencies in the study. Fifteen of the agencies in this group were of a regulatory type, five were advisory in nature, and four were governing boards. The fact that four were governing boards was a surprise since these boards are generally presumed to focus solely on public institutions. Twenty-two of the 24 plans generally were focused on all higher or postsecondary education. The plan in two of the four governing-board states was focused on only public higher education despite private institution involvement in the planning process.

The overwhelming majority of these state agencies (17 of 24) were operating under statutory authority to plan for both public and private colleges. Two governing boards were among these 17 agencies, thereby combining a governance responsibility for public institutions with a planning perspective that included both public and private higher education. Seven agencies had no statutory authority to plan for the private sector but nevertheless chose to seek private college participation. This resulted from either a general agency policy to involve the private sector in decision making, or a decision made for a specific planning effort. It is interesting to note that one of the seven agencies was a governing board.

The five state agencies listed in Table 4 as not preparing a long-range plan is somewhat misleading because three of them recently experienced a change in organizational structure or responsibilities and had not had sufficient time to mount a large-scale planning activity. Consequently, only two state-level agencies truly represent this category, i.e., no long-range plan conducted in the preceding five years. Interestingly, both agencies had some type of statutory planning authority. One had a mandate to plan for public higher education but had not done so because of inadequate staffing. The other had planning authority for both public and private sectors, but was reported to have had this responsibility usurped by a legislative committee that developed a plan in 1972.

Eleven state agencies were reported as having developed a long-range plan in the preceding five years without private college participation. Nine of the 11 were governing boards with statutory authority to plan only for the public institutions under their jurisdiction. The remaining two agencies were regulatory boards with statutory authority to plan for public higher education and to consider private college interests. As the private college respondent

TABLE 4

State Agency Authority and Practice in Long Range Planning

State Agency Authority and Practice	Private Colleges Involved	Number of Agencies
No Authority		
No plan prepared	Not Applicable	1
Statutory Authority: Public Colleges		
Plan just being undertaken	Uncertain	4
Plan conducted	No	11
Plan conducted	Yes	7
No plan prepared	Not Applicable	1
Statutory Authority: Public and Private Colleges		
Plan just being undertaken	Uncertain	1
Plan conducted	No	0
Plan conducted	Yes	17
No plan prepared	Not Applicable	3
Total		45

in one of these two states reported, a directive to consider is not the same as mandate to involve in a substantive way. Both public and private college respondents reported that the plans developed by these eleven state agencies were focused almost exclusively on public higher education.

Kind of Private College Participation

As mentioned earlier the methods for including private colleges in state agency activities varied by nature and type and, depending

upon the combination employed, provided greater or lesser degrees of access to decision making.

For the 24 agencies which had included private colleges in a recent planning effort, 12 different methods were used in varying combinations to involve the private sector. The methods used most often were membership on a plan specific advisory group or task group (14 agencies); membership on an advisory committee of private college representatives (12 agencies); membership on a general advisory committee to the agency (12 agencies); and responding to draft document (11 agencies). The frequency of use for all participation methods is presented in Appendix B.

A review of all methods used by each of the 24 agencies resulted in none being designated as having provided private colleges with reactive participation. Respondents in 20 states indicated that at least one ad hoc-consultative method had been used, but always in combination with another method which provided even greater access to decision making processes.

Private college participation was described as advisory in seven states. Respondents reported that all seven utilized at least one method from the ad hoc-consultative and standing-consultative categories. Most frequently, the particular combination involved securing private college comments on draft documents and utilizing an advisory committee of private college representatives.

Twelve state agencies provided formative type participation for private colleges with five of them reportedly using at least one method from the ad hoc-consultative, standing-consultative, and ad hoc-substantive groups. Two other agencies used only ad hoc-substantive methods while the remaining five agencies used varying combinations of methods.

Five state agencies provided private colleges with voting participation as a result of private college membership on the agency board. All of these agencies used at least one method from other groups, but almost no duplication existed among them with regard to the specific combination.

Evaluating the Planning Relationship

State agency and private college respondents were asked to estimate satisfaction with the procedures used to secure private college participation in long-range planning and with the completed plan. In addition state agency respondents were asked to assess the private college contribution to the planning effort. Respondents were asked to indicate satisfaction along a four-point scale: 4 = completely; 3 = somewhat; 2 = not too; 1 = not at all. Satisfaction scores were

compared by respondent group and by type of private college participation.

As discussed earlier, private colleges participated in state agency, long-range planning in 24 states. The assessment of satisfaction with the methods used to secure private college participation was based on responses from state agency and private college respondents in 22 of the 24 states. Mean satisfaction scores, delineated by respondent group and by participation classification, are presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5

Satisfaction With Procedure Used to Secure Private College Participation in Long Range Planning

Respondents	Mean Satisfaction Scores by Kind of Private College Participation			
	Advisory (n=7)	Formative (n=11)	Voting (n=4)	Total (n=22)
State Agency	3.14	3.63	3.0	3.36
Private College	2.28	3.45	3.0	3.00

Satisfaction Scale: 4 = Completely; 3 = Somewhat; 2 = Not too; and 1 = Not At All.

Overall satisfaction with the procedures used was reasonably high for both groups of respondents. However, some differences were found when results were compared by type of private college participation. State agency and private college respondents preferred formative as opposed to advisory or voting participation for the private sector in long-range planning. The private sector was found to dislike advisory participation the most.

State agency respondents also were asked to estimate agency satisfaction with the private college contribution to the planning process. Responses were secured from 18 of the 24 participants. The other six respondents indicated either that the planning activity was yet to be completed and that such an assessment was premature or that they would not make such a judgement. Satisfaction

scores, delineated by kind of private college participation are presented in Table 6.

TABLE 6

Satisfaction With the Private College Contribution to the Development of a Recent Long Range Plan

Respondent Group	Mean Satisfaction Scores by Kind of Private College Participation			
	Advisory (n=6)	Formative (n=8)	Voting (n=4)	Total (n=18)
State Agency	3.00	3.38	3.00	3.16

Satisfaction Scale: 4 = Completely; 3 = Somewhat; 2 = Not Too; and 1 = Not At All.

Inspection of the data in Table 6 reveals a fairly high level of satisfaction with the private college contribution to the planning process, regardless of the particular strategy used to involve the private sector. Evidently initial state agency expectations for the private sector were adequately fulfilled.

In 17 states, private college and state agency estimates also were secured concerning satisfaction with completed planning documents. The responses (summarized in Table 7) indicate that private colleges were less satisfied with completed plans than were state agencies. This is particularly significant given results of the earlier analysis which revealed that both state agencies and private colleges were generally satisfied with the methods used to secure private college participation. For private colleges at least, satisfaction with the means of input did not carry over to results.

State agency and private college respondents indicated greater satisfaction with the completed plan in those states where methods other than formal voting membership were utilized to secure private college participation in the planning process. Earlier it was found that formative strategies were the preferred alternative for involving private colleges in planning processes. Both of these findings, plus the lack of use of a reactive strategy by a single state agency, indicate a preference for private college participation strategies

TABLE 7

Satisfaction With the Completed Plan

Respondent Group	Mean Satisfaction Scores by Kind of Private College Participation			
	Advisory (n=6)	Formative (n=6)	Voting (n=5)	Total (n=17)
State Agency	3.50	3.50	2.60	3.24
Private College	3.00	2.83	2.00	2.65

Satisfaction Scale: 4 = Completely; 3 = Somewhat; 2 = Not Too; and 1 = Not At All.

that involve less direct entanglement with state agencies than usually occurs with agency board membership. In addition there is a desire for private colleges to have the substantive role in planning that occurs when advisory or formative strategies are used.

IV. PRIVATE COLLEGE PARTICIPATION IN STATE AGENCY PROGRAM REVIEW ACTIVITIES

State agency program review authority and practices constituted the second principal area of inquiry for this study. Respondents were asked to identify: 1) what programs the state agency was charged to review by statute; 2) what programs actually were being reviewed; and 3) whether and how private colleges were involved in the review processes. These questions were asked in relation to the review of new programs in public and private colleges and existing programs in public and private colleges. Findings are summarized in Tables 8 and 9 and are discussed below.

Public College New Program Reviews

Forty-three of the 45 state agencies surveyed had some authority and were currently reviewing new program proposals developed by public colleges. In only 22 instances, however, were private colleges involved in the review process (see Table 8). These 22 agencies included 15 regulatory boards, four advisory boards, and three governing boards. With only three exceptions, the new program review authority of these 22 agencies extended to all new programs in public colleges.

Seven different methods were used by the 22 state agencies involving private colleges in public college new program reviews (see Appendix C for a frequency of use summary). The methods used most often were circulation of public college program proposals among private colleges for comment (an ad hoc-consultative method), and representation on a general advisory committee to the agency (a standing-consultative method). In analyzing the specific combination of methods used by each state agency to involve the private sector, it was found that reactive strategies were used most frequently, i.e., exclusive use was made of ad hoc-consultative methods. Nine state agencies were classified as providing private colleges with reactive participation in public college new program reviews (see Table 9). The other thirteen agencies were distributed rather evenly among the remaining three participation classifications (advisory: 4; formative: 5; and voting: 4).

Public College Existing Program Reviews

State agency reviews of existing programs in public colleges introduced a degree of complexity not found with new program review investigations. Existing program reviews varied greatly in scope and purpose. For example, some state agencies reviewed all existing programs on a regular basis (comprehensive reviews) while others conducted periodic reviews of selected programs (generic reviews). As long as the focus of the review was statewide and involved

TABLE 8

State Agency Authority and Practice Concerning
the Review of Public and Private College Programs

Program Review Authority	Public College Programs			Private College Programs		
	Number Agencies	Reviews Conducted	Private Colleges Involved	Number of Agencies	Reviews Conducted	Private Colleges Involved
New Programs						
1. No Authority	2	0	0	36	1	1
2. Review and Recommend Authority	6	6	4	3	3	3
3. Must Approve	37	37	18	5	5	5
4. Unclear Authority	0	0	0	1	1	1
Total	45	43	22	45	10	10
Existing Programs						
1. No Authority	8	1	0	42	2	2
2. Review and Recommend Authority	12	10	3	2	2	2
3. Can Deauthorize	24	22	4	0	0	0
4. Unclear Authority	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total	45	34	8	45	5	5

TABLE 9

Classification of the Kind of Private College Participation
in the Program Review Activities of
State-Level Higher Education Agencies

Classification	Public College New Program Reviews	Public College Existing Program Reviews	Private College New Program Reviews	Private College Existing Program Reviews
Reactive	9	1	4	1
Advisory	4	2	1	0
Formative	5	4	3	3
Voting	4	1	1	1
Total	22	8	9	5

NOTE: Appendix G contains the state-by-state detail used to prepare Table 9.

comparisons among institutions, the review process was analyzed as part of this study. In a few states the state agency review authority for existing programs was restricted to qualitative reviews resulting from state licensure or accrediting responsibilities. Such reviews were eliminated from this study because of the institutional and normative focus; that is, they involved a judgment about a single institution against a statewide standard.

Table 8 indicates that 34 of the 45 state agencies being studied had a review process for existing programs in public colleges. Private colleges were involved in only eight of the 34 instances. These eight agencies included three with the authority to make recommendations, four with the authority to discontinue existing programs, and one with unclear authority. In general the strategy being followed in these eight states was one of periodically conducting reviews on a state-wide basis of all programs of a particular type. Sometimes the review procedure also involved agency oversight of an institutional review process.

In the eight states where private colleges participated in the review, participation was achieved through: 1) membership on a general agency advisory committee (three states); 2) representation on the agency (one state); 3) contact with agency staff who were responsible for review activities (one state); 4) membership on review teams or committees (two states); and 5) helping to select consultants to conduct the review (three states). Based on the combination of methods employed, private college participation was classified as reactive for one state agency, advisory for two agencies, formative for four agencies, and voting for one agency (See Table 9).

Private College New Program Reviews

State agency reviews of new programs in private colleges occurred in only a few instances. The data in Table 8 reveal that the state agencies were conducting such reviews in 10 of the 45 states surveyed. Only eight of the ten reviews occurred under clear statutory authority. Five agencies were required to approve a new program proposal before it could be implemented while three were charged to make a recommendation concerning implementation. Six of the eight agencies were regulatory in nature, one was advisory, and the remaining one was a governing board.

The scope of the review activities for these eight agencies varied significantly. Two agencies reviewed all new programs in all private institutions; one reviewed all new programs in the majority of the private colleges in the state (those established after a certain date); and two agencies restricted their activity to new program fields as opposed to enlargements of existing ones

(for example, a new nursing program would be reviewed but not a new business economics curriculum in an existing business program). For the remaining three agencies one reviewed new programs in private institutions receiving state aid; one reviewed new programs that would extend the institution's charter; and one reviewed only nursing programs. Given this limited private college review relationship, the latter agency (a governing board) was eliminated from subsequent analysis.

Two agencies were conducting reviews of new programs in the private sector without legislative authority. One was the Commission on Higher Education in Alabama which had established a State Graduate Council to help in reviewing new graduate program proposals. The two private institutions in the state with graduate programs were invited to participate on the condition that their programs would be submitted to the Council for review along with those of the public institutions. The private colleges agreed and were participating as full voting members of the Council. The Council had no regulatory authority; it only made recommendations to the institutions and to the Commission.

In the second state, Missouri, the relationship between the private sector and the Coordinating Board for Higher Education was less formal and less clear than was the case in Alabama. The Misouri Board's authority to review new programs in private institutions was the subject of debate because of conflicting interpretations of the legislative mandate to the Board to approve new programs of "State" institutions. One interpretation was that the Board's authority extended only to public institutions (often referred to as state institutions). Another interpretation of the statute was that the Board should review new programs of all institutions located in the state. Capitalization of the word "State" in the enabling legislation was one cause of the confusion. With this uncertainty the Board was simply making recommendations to each private institution as program proposals were submitted. Respondents indicated that the private institutions usually submitted new program proposals for Board review although the financial data which accompanied such requests from public institutions usually were not included in the private college proposals.

For the nine state agencies conducting somewhat comprehensive reviews of new programs in private colleges, seven different methods were used to secure private college participation. The most frequently used methods were direct contact with the agency staff (six states) and review of program announcements (four states). See Appendix E for complete frequency of method use information.

As revealed in Table 9 four state agencies used only ad hoc-consultative methods, thus resulting in private college participation being classified as reactive. In these four instances the review

of new programs in the private sector was conducted by the agency staff with private college participation restricted to reacting and commenting at some point during the review process. Most frequently, such comments were solicited in the very early or very late stages of the review. For example, all four of the agencies in this group invited private colleges to inform the agency of the estimated impact of a new program on existing efforts. In addition, two of the four agencies encouraged the private sector to testify at board meetings or public hearings once a draft of the review report was prepared. Although participation seems limited, data to be discussed later suggests that the private sector was satisfied with the approach. One could argue that this reflects less interest among private colleges in monitoring their own program development efforts, preferring to participate more actively in review processes focusing on proposals from public institutions.

Only one agency was identified as using an advisory approach. In that instance, private colleges participated in the review of new programs in private colleges through membership on a segmental advisory committee (an advisory committee composed of representatives from each segment of postsecondary education). Essentially the reviews were conducted by the agency staff with private college participation restricted to direct contact with the staff or to the deliberations of the segmental advisory committee.

The formative approach was used by three agencies, each securing private college participation through membership on a standing committee given program review responsibility. Only one of the three, however, reviewed all new program proposals of private colleges; the other two limited their efforts to either graduate programs or to programs outside the charter of restricted charter institutions (for example, to an institution chartered as a liberal arts college that proposed to begin offering professional degree programs). One of the three agencies in this group also utilized regional, planning council involvement as a way to bring the private sector into review processes.

Finally, one state agency used the voting approach as a result of private college membership on the board of the agency. For this state, new program reviews were largely conducted by the staff with some private college input early in the process (e.g., commenting on the impact of new programs in other private colleges) and a more substantial role in the decision of the board concerning implementation.

In summary, consideration of the methods used by the nine agencies led to private college participation being classified as reactive

for four state agencies, advisory for one agency, formative for three agencies, and voting for one agency.

Private College Existing Program Reviews

Only five state agencies reviewed existing degree programs in private colleges and universities (see Table 8). Two of the five agencies (one regulatory board and one governing board) had no statutory authority for such review activities, relying instead on such things as perceived need, initiative, and cooperation. Two advisory agencies had statutory authority to review existing programs in private colleges and to make recommendations concerning continuation. One regulatory agency was operating with unclear review authority.

The five agencies which were reviewing existing programs in private colleges also were among the eight agencies conducting such reviews for public colleges. Five different methods were used to secure private college participation with direct contact with agency staff utilized most frequently (four states). Frequency of use for the other methods is detailed in Appendix F.

All but one of the five agencies being considered used at least two participation methods. A review of these combinations resulted in private college participation being classified as reactive for one state agency because private college participation extended only to supplying data and information to the reviewing body. One other agency provided voting participation as a result of private college membership on the agency board. Private participation for the remaining three agencies was classified as formative because of representation on review teams or involvement in the development of guidelines for, and selection of, outside consultants.

Program Review Satisfaction

For all four program review activites, respondents were asked to estimate satisfaction with the procedure used to secure private college participation. Satisfaction scores were generally high for all four activities and for both respondent groups. Detailed analysis of satisfaction scores seemed appropriate only for the public college new program review activity; the other three program review areas involved too small a number of cases. However, mean satisfaction scores for these three activities are displayed in Appendix H.

As Table 10 indicates, state agency and private college satisfaction scores were available in 21 of the 22 instances where private colleges were involved in public college new program reviews.

TABLE 10

Satisfaction With the Procedure Used to Involve Private Colleges in State Agency Reviews of Public College New Program Proposals

Respondent Group	Mean Satisfaction Scores by Kind of Private College Participation				
	Reactive (n=9)	Advisory (n=3)	Formative (n=5)	Voting (n=4)	Total (n=21)
State Agency	3.33	4.00	3.80	3.75	3.45
Private College	2.89	2.33	3.60	2.50	2.77

Satisfaction Scale: 4 = Completely; 3 = Somewhat; 2 = Not Too; and 1 = Not At All.

State agency respondents consistently indicated greater satisfaction than did private college participants. Differences between the two groups were greatest when reactive, advisory, or voting strategies had been used to involve the private sector. Relatively high satisfaction was reported by both groups when formative approaches were used.

V. EXPLAINING STATE VARIATIONS IN PRIVATE COLLEGE PARTICIPATION

Thus far attention has been focused primarily on describing and, to a limited extent, evaluating state agency and private college relationships in long range planning and program review activities. These activities were considered individually with little reference to general trends. In order to consider the overall planning and program review relationships in the states and to make an initial attempt to explain the patterns that existed, it was necessary to bring the pieces together. This was done by arraying the states according to the extent of private college participation in the state agency activities under study.

Explanatory Analysis

Thirteen different patterns were required to portray the extent of private college participation in state agency long range planning and program reviews (see Table 11). Most frequently the pattern involved private college participation in long range planning and the review of new programs of public colleges (eight states). Next in frequency of use was private involvement only in long range planning (six states). In total, the state agencies in 30 states were found to have included the private sector in at least one planning or program review activity. For the remaining states studied, thirteen were identified where the state agency had conducted a long range plan or reviewed programs without private college participation, and two instances were identified where such activities had not been conducted.

One of the more interesting questions pursued through this research was the attempt to explain why private colleges were involved in agency activities in some states but not in others. To begin answering this question the states were divided into two groups. One group included the 30 states where private colleges participated in state agency, long range planning or program review activities, and a second group included the 13 states where private colleges were not involved in such activities. The two groups were then compared with respect to the nine variables presented below. The individual state data and data sources for each of the variables are detailed in Appendix I.

TABLE 11

Patterns of Private College Involvement in Long Range Planning and Program Review Activities of State-Level Agencies

Patterns	Number of Agencies Included
Long Range Planning	
1. Private colleges involved only in long range planning.	6
Long Range Planning and Program Review	
2. Private colleges involved in long range planning and review of new programs of public colleges.	8
3. Private colleges involved in long range planning and review of new and existing programs in public colleges.	1
4. Private colleges involved in long range planning and review of new and existing programs in public colleges and new programs in private colleges.	1
5. Private colleges involved in long range planning and review of new and existing programs in public and private colleges.	2
6. Private colleges involved in long range planning and review of new programs in public and private colleges.	4
7. Private colleges involved in long range planning and review of new programs in public colleges and review of existing programs in public and private colleges.	2
Program Review	
8. Private colleges only involved in review of new programs in public colleges.	2

TABLE 11 (continued)

Patterns	Number of Agencies Included
9. Private colleges only involved in review of new programs in public and private colleges and existing programs in public colleges	1
10. Private colleges only involved in review of new programs in public and private colleges	1
11. Private colleges only involved in review of existing programs in public and private colleges	1
12. Private colleges only involved in review of new programs in private colleges	1
Neither Long Range Planning Nor Program Review	
13. Private colleges not involved in long range planning or in program review activities	13
14. No long range planning effort of program review conducted	2
Total	45

Structural Characteristics

1. type of statewide higher education agency
2. agency designated as the 1202 Commission
3. whether a private college liaison served on the state agency staff

Private College Presence

4. percentage of private college enrollment composed of resident (in-state) students for each state
5. percentage of colleges in each state that were private
6. percentage of total college enrollment in private colleges in each state

State Wealth

7. tax revenues per capita for each state

State Commitment to Higher Education

8. percentage of tax revenues appropriated to higher education

State Commitment to Private Higher Education

9. types of state aid to private higher education

Structural Variables

State agency type was found to have a clear relationship to the presence of operating relationships between state agencies and private colleges. As Table 12 indicates, the 30 agencies conducting plans or reviewing programs with private college assistance included 5 advisory agencies, 17 regulatory agencies, and 8 governing boards. The 22 advisory and regulatory agencies represented 88 percent (22 of 25) of the advisory and regulatory agencies involved in planning or program review. Only 44 percent (8 of 18) of the governing boards undertaking planning or program review activities involved the private sector in these processes. It is clear that advisory and regulatory agencies are more likely than governing boards to seek or secure private college participation in planning and program review activities, although governing structures do not preclude such participation.

From the data in Table 12 it also is apparent that the group of states involving private colleges in state agency, long range planning or program reviews was more likely than the group operating without private college participation to have designated the state agency as the 1202 Commission (47 percent and 23 percent respectively), and less likely to have designated some other agency (17 percent as opposed to 30 percent). This should be expected given that the role prescribed for the 1202 Commissions involved providing a forum for discussion between all postsecondary sectors. The two groups were approximately equal in the percentage of augmented state agencies which served as 1202 Commissions and in the percentage of states without a Commission.

A final structural comparison between the two groups focused on whether a private college liaison had been formally designated by the state-level agency. As the data in Table 12 reveals, neither group had designated such liaisons to a significant extent. For both groups, approximately 25 percent of the state agencies had such a liaison. Clearly the designation of a liaison does not distinguish between the two groups in any way.

For the three structural variables, only agency type and 1202 Commission designation were related to private colleges' involvement

TABLE 12

The Relationship Between Selected Structural Characteristics of the States and Private College Involvement in State Agency Long Range Planning and Program Review Activities

Structural Characteristics	Group I[a] (n=30)	Group II[b] (n=13)
1. Number of states where the state agency was:		
a. Advisory in nature	5	1
b. Regulatory in nature	17	2
c. Governing in nature	8	10
2. Number of states in which the 1202 Commission:		
a. Was the statewide higher education agency	14	3
b. Was the statewide higher education agency with augmented membership	8	4
c. Was not the statewide higher education agency	5	5
d. Does not exist	3	1
3. Number of states in which a private college liaison served on the state agency staff	8	3

[a]States where private colleges were involved in state agency long range planning or program review activities.

[b]States where private colleges were not involved in state agency long range planning or program review activities.

in state agency planning and program review activities. However, structural considerations alone were not sufficient to explain the private college involvement patterns in every instance.

Private College Presence Variables

The two groups of states also were compared with respect to three indicators of private college presence: 1) the percentage of private college enrollment composed of resident (in-state) students for each state; 2) the percentage of all colleges in each state that were private; and 3) the percentage of collegiate

enrollment in private institutions for each state. Table 13 reports how each group of states compared with national percentages for each variable.

The two groups of states were different with respect to the percentage of colleges in the states which were private, and the percentage of each state's total enrollment in private institutions. No difference was found for the variable concerned with the percentage of each state's private college enrollment composed of resident (in-state) students. Thus, private college participation in state agency long range planning and program review activities occurred most frequently in states with a relatively high percentage of students enrolled in the private sector, regardless of whether or not the students themselves were state residents.

State Wealth and Commitment Variables

State wealth and state commitment to higher education were studied by securing data for tax revenues per capita in each state, and the percentage of tax revenues appropriated to higher education in each state. Table 14 compares the two groups of states in relation to national averages for the two variables. Although the relationship to national averages was not substantially different for the two groups of states, the 13 states which excluded the private sector from state agency planning and program reviews exceeded the national average for tax revenues appropriated to higher education in a higher percentage of states than did the 30 states where private colleges were included in agency activities (77 percent and 50 percent respectively). However, the differences found between the two groups of states for both financial variables were not sufficient to establish a clear linkage between state finances and the use made of the private sector in state agency planning and program review.

State Financial Commitment to Private Higher Education

The final variable examined was concerned with each state's financial commitment to private higher education. Five general types of commitment were identified: aid to institutions for general purposes (i.e., to be used at the institution's discretion); aid to specific institutions; funding for specific programs; student aid; and facilities aid. The data in Table 15 compare the two groups of states with respect to the frequency of use of these aid programs.

For four of the aid programs very little difference existed between the two groups with respect to the percentage of states providing such aid. Differences were found for facilities aid and aid for general purposes. In these two instances all of the states

TABLE 13

The Relationship Between Selected Indicators of Private College Presence in Each State and the Involvement of Private Colleges in State Agency Long Range Planning and Program Review Activities

Private College Presence Variables	Group I[a]		Group II[b]	
	Number (n=30)	Percentage	Number (n=13)	Percentage
1. States in which the % of private college enrollment composed of resident (in-state) students was:				
a. Above the % nationally	13	43	5	38
b. Below the % nationally	17	57	8	62
2. States in which the % of private colleges was:				
a. Above the % nationally	15	50	2	15
b. Below the % nationally	15	50	11	85
3. States in which the % of collegiate enrollment in private institutions was:				
a. Above the % nationally	14	46	2	15
b. Below the % nationally	16	54	11	85

[a]States where private colleges were involved in state agency long range planning or program review activities.

[b]States where private colleges were not involved in state agency long range planning or program review activities.

TABLE 14

The Relationship Between Selected Indicators of State Wealth and Commitment to Higher Education and the Involvement of Private Colleges in State Agency Long Range Planning and Program Review Activities

State Wealth and Commitment to Higher Education Variables	Group I[a]		Group II[b]	
	Number (n=30)	Percentage	Number (n=13)	Percentage
1. Number of states in which the tax revenues per capita:				
a. Exceeded the national average	9	30	2	15
b. Fell below the national average	21	70	11	85
2. Number of states in which the % of tax revenues appropriated to higher education:				
a. Exceeded the % nationally	15	50	10	77
b. Fell below the % nationally	15	50	3	23

[a] States where private colleges were involved in state agency long range planning or program review activities.

[b] States where private colleges were not involved in state agency long range planning or program review activities.

TABLE 15

The Relationship Between Types of State Aid to the Private Sector and Private College Involvement in State Agency Long Range Planning and Program Review Activities

State Commitment to Private Higher Education Variable	Group I[a]		Group II[b]	
	Number (n=30)	Percentage	Number (n=13)	Percentage
Number of states which aided private colleges through:				
a. Aid for general purposes	8	27	0	0
b. Aid to specific institutions	11	37	4	31
c. Funds for specific purposes	20	67	8	62
d. Student aid				
1) Grants	25	83	10	77
2) Loans	11	37	3	23
e. Facilities aid	10	33	0	0

[a]State where private colleges were involved in state agency long range planning or program review activities.

[b]State where private colleges were not involved in state agency long range planning or program review activities.

providing such aid also involved private colleges in long range planning or program review decisions. This finding would suggest that unrestricted institutional aid and aid to improve physical facilities is associated with some type of opportunity or obligation for the private sector to be involved in state agency long range planning and program activities.

The above discussion indicates that no single indicator can be used to predict whether a state agency will include the private sector in long range planning and program review activities. Certainly no causal factors were identified since no data were secured

about the sequence in which various relationships developed. Nevertheless, three or four factors have been identified which provide some insight as to why these relationships have emerged.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Operating relationships with private colleges have been developed by a substantial number of state agencies in the areas of long range planning and public college new program review. (See Table 16 for activity summary.) Private college participation was identified in approximately half of the states for both activities. Participation methods varied but formative approaches were in the majority for long range planning while reactive strategies were utilized to a greater extent in public college new program reviews. Part of this difference in type of participation may be explained by the nature of the two activities. Long range planning generally involves a systematic attempt to anticipate the future so that current decisions can take advantage of opportunities and minimize constraints. Use of long range planning results is often dependent upon individual or institutional initiative over time. Program review activities, on the other hand, have immediate operational impacts. Respondents reported great hesitation about establishing formative-type relationships between state agencies and private colleges in areas where decisions would have this kind of direct operational consequences.

Private college participation in the review of existing programs in public colleges was occurring in a relatively small number of states. A substantial number of the state agencies were conducting such reviews (34 of 45), but private colleges were formally involved in only eight instances. Part of this infrequent participation can be traced to institutional hesitancy about subjecting internal activities to external scrutiny and to the relatively recent movement of state agencies into this activity. In most states the motivation to undertake existing program reviews arose only after it became apparent that the states would not be supporting higher education to the extent found in the 1960's. Inflation, high unemployment rates, soaring welfare roles, and shifting state priorities have all contributed to greater legislative concern over the efficiency and effectiveness of programs supported by state expenditures. These pressures have resulted in increasing attention being given to existing programs of public colleges and to the existing program review authority of state agencies.

The Issue of Reciprocal Reviews

State agency reviews of new and existing programs in private colleges also was identified for only a few states (nine and five respectively). Such activity raises the issue of equity. State

TABLE 16

Summary of State Agency and Private College Interaction in Recent Long Range Planning and Program Review Activities

State Agency Activities	Total (n=45)
Long Range Planning	
1. Agencies preparing a plan in the last five years	35
2. Agencies involving private colleges in the plan	24
New Program Review: Public Colleges	
1. Agencies conducting reviews	43
2. Agencies involving private colleges in reviews	22
Existing Program Reviews: Public Colleges	
1. Agencies conducting reviews	34
2. Agencies involving private colleges in reviews	8
Existing Program Reviews: Public Colleges	
1. Agencies conducting reviews	10
2. Agencies involving private colleges in reviews	10
Existing Program Reviews: Private Colleges	
1. Agencies conducting reviews	5
2. Agencies involving private colleges in reviews	5

agency respondents reported that public institutions felt they were disadvantaged in the program review process because private colleges were frequently asked to help review public college programs without reciprocal opportunities being extended to public colleges. This is an important issue but one that has been satisfactorily resolved in only a few states.

In Minnesota, the Higher Education Coordinating Board has implemented a program review process that focuses on new and existing programs of both public and private colleges. This process begins with initial staff reviews which are forwarded to a curriculum advisory committee, composed of public and private college representatives, which submits a recommendation to the Board. Both

public and private colleges participate in a formative way and seem satisfied with the process and results. Other examples of attempts by state agencies to address the equity issue in program review activities include the use of a semi-autonomous council of public and private college deans in Alabama; a segmental advisory committee by the Maryland State Board; the use of regional planning councils by the state boards of New York and Pennsylvania; and the use of consulting teams (which both public and private colleges help select) by the systemwide office in Florida.

All of these strategies are attempts to be responsive to public college concerns about review reciprocity and, to a certain extent, require a commitment in good faith on the part of all institutions and the state agency. The success of these strategies should be monitored because the credibility of future state-level reviews depends, in part, on the ingenuity of state-level agencies in developing review procedures that provide both public and private colleges with reciprocal opportunities to participate in review processes and reciprocal obligations with respect to results.

Evaluating Operating Relationships

This study revealed an overall high level of state agency and private college satisfaction with the means of private college participation in the five activities being investigated. State agencies were consistently more satisfied with the participation strategies than were private colleges. The level of overall satisfaction attributed to private colleges was somewhat unexpected given the relatively recent movement of state agencies to include private colleges in planning and program review activities.

Some differences in satisfaction were found when results for specific participation strategies were analyzed. Both respondent groups were happiest with formative as opposed to advisory or voting participation for private colleges in long range planning. The private college preference for formative participation carried over to the public college new program review activitiy, but this preference was not characteristic of the state agency response.

It was surprising that greater dissatisfaction was not registered given the frequent respondent comments about the inequities in public versus private involvement in planning and program review processes. It could be that the assessment of satisfaction in this study was too general and that a series of more penetrating questions are required to adequately address the issue.

Satisfaction with process matters did not carry over to results. Private colleges and state agencies were found to differ in terms of satisfaction with completed plans. Private college satisfaction was lower than that reported for the state agencies. Since the plans, for the most part, focused on the public sector, some private college

dissatisfaction should be expected. The question remains, however, whether the dissatisfaction reflects a very narrow proprietary interest on the part of the state agency in preparing the plans or on the part of the private sector in evaluating the finished product.

Implications of Explanatory Variable Analysis

In 30 of the 45 states, private colleges participated in some or all of the long range planning and program review activities. In trying to explain why private colleges were involved in some states but not in others, nine variables were examined: 1) three structural variables, 2) three private college presence variables, and 3) three financial variables.

Among the three structural variables, only agency type and 1202 Commission designation seemed related to private college participation. Advisory and regulatory boards which had been designated as 1202 Commissions (with regular or augmented membership) were more likely to include private colleges in long range planning and/or program reviews than were governing boards or other agencies without 1202 responsibilities.

The structural characteristics of a state agency, both in general orientation and in specific relation to 1202 Commission mandates, provide considerable insight into state interests in comprehensive postsecondary planning and programming. A state with a very narrow concern for specific subsets of postsecondary education reflects this in the design of its coordinating structure. However, development of statewide agencies are, to some extent, time specific with current structures often reflecting past outlooks. The problems involved in changing the structure of an established statewide agency are formidable and, consequently, some agencies have had to overcome structural limitations in order to implement currently desirable policies. Based on this research it would seem that advisory and regulatory structures facilitate private college participation in agency activities but, by no means, are a necessary condition.

Private college participation in state agency activities also was related to two of the private college presence variables. Such participation was more likely to occur in states with a high percentage of private colleges and a high percentage of total collegiate enrollment in private institutions. The percentage of private college enrollment composed of in-state students did not seem related to private college participation in state-wide activities. This would suggest that private college involvement is not a function of service to in-state students but rather to the relative number of private colleges in each state and to overall

enrollment levels in these institutions. The states seem to be more responsive to the private sector if that sector is comprised of several institutions which educate a significant number of students than if the private sector enrollment consists of a high percentage of in-state students.

With respect to the last three variables, tax revenues per capita and the percentage of tax revenues appropriated to higher education were not related to private college participation. A relationship was found for two of the six financial aid programs examined. All of the states providing facilities assistance and general institutional aid (unrestricted aid) also secured private college participation in recent planning or program review activities.

These findings suggest that private college participation in state agency planning and program review activities may result from increased state awareness of the private sector because of the relative size of that sector and because of a state agency structure that facilitates interaction without stirring institutional concerns about autonomy. Although the size of the private sector may help explain their involvement in state-wide planning or program review, it is not very useful to consider size as a variable to manipulate in order to alter the state agency and private college relationship. However, agency structure is another matter. The legislative and executive branches of government in most states frequently assess the effectiveness of the agency charged to coordinate higher education, and proposals to reorganize the agencies surface regularly. In evaluating these proposals state-level decision-makers should recognize that agency structure can be an inhibiting or facilitating element in efforts aimed at achieving statewide planning and programming objectives.

APPENDIX A

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS

Alabama:	Dr. Charles C. Turner, Coordinator, Council for the Advancement of Private Colleges in Alabama Dr. John F. Porter, Executive Director, Commission on Higher Education
Arizona:	Dr. William Hintze, President, Grand Canyon College Mr. Lawrence E. Woodall, Executive Coordinator, State Board of Regents
Arkansas:	Mr. Max K. Jones, President, Arkansas Council of Independent Colleges and Universities Dr. M. Olin Cook, Executive Director, Department of Higher Education
California:	Dr. Morgan Odell, Executive Director, Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities Mr. Bruce Hamlett, Associate Higher Education Specialist, California Postsecondary Education Commission Dr. Norman Charles, Associate Higher Education Specialist, California Postsecondary Education Commission
Colorado:	Dr. Dumont Kenny, Executive Director, Associated Colleges of Colorado Dr. Frank C. Abbott, Executive Director, Commission on Higher Education
Connecticut:	Dr. W. Lewis Hyde, Executive Director, Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges Dr. Louis Rabineau, Chancellor of Higher Education, Commission for Higher Education
Florida:	Dr. Sidney L. Besvinick, Dean of Academic Administration and Planning, University of Miami Dr. E. T. York, Jr., Chancellor, State University System of Florida
Georgia:	Dr. Dupree Jordon, Jr., Executive Director, Association of Private Colleges and Universities in Georgia

Georgia:	Dr. Howard Jordon, Jr., Vice Chancellor-Services, Regents of the University System
Hawaii:	Dr. Helen Volkomener, Academic Vice President, Chaminade College of Honolulu Dr. Durward Long, Vice President, University of Hawaii System
Idaho:	Mr. William Cassell, President, College of Idaho Mr. Milton Small, Executive Director for Higher Education, State Board of Education Dr. Clifford M. Trump, Deputy Director for Curriculum Planning, State Board of Education
Illinois:	Mr. Alan Weber, President, Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities Dr. James M. Furman, Executive Director, Board of Higher Education
Indiana:	Dr. Robert E. Martin, President, Independent Colleges and Universities of Indiana Dr. Richard Gibb, Commissioner for Higher Education, Commission for Higher Education
Iowa:	Dr. Wendell O. Halverson, President, Iowa Association of Private Colleges and Universities Mr. Robert J. Barak, Director of Research and Information, Board of Regents
Kansas:	Dr. D. Arthur Zook, Executive Director, Associated Independent Colleges of Kansas Mr. Max Bickford, Executive Officer, Board of Regents
Kentucky:	Mr. John W. Frazer, Executive Director, Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities Dr. Robert Carter, Coordinator of Planning, Council on Public Higher Education
Louisiana:	Dr. John F. Keller, President, Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Louisiana Dr. William Arceneaux, Commissioner of Higher Education, State Board of Regents
Maine:	Dr. Robert E. L. Strider, Acting Coordinator, Commission on Independent Colleges Ms. Joanne McGill, Assistant to the Chancellor, Board of Trustees of the University of Maine

Maryland:	Ms. Elizabeth Garraway, Executive Director, Maryland Independent College and University Association
	Dr. Sheldon H. Knorr, Director, Council for Higher Education
Massachusetts:	Mr. Robert M. Hyde, Vice President for Public Affairs, Association of Independent Colleges and Universities in Massachusetts
	Mr. Frank A. Tredinnick, Jr., Executive Vice President, Association of Independent Colleges and Universities in Massachusetts
	Mr. James A. True, Vice President for Governmental Relations, Association of Independent Colleges and Universities in Massachusetts
	Ms. Judy Schworm, Staff Associate for Academic Affairs, Board of Higher Education
	Ms. Harriet Rose, Senior Staff Associate for Academic Affairs, Board of Higher Education
Michigan:	Dr. James Hatcher, Vice President, Association of Independent Colleges and Universities in Michigan
	Dr. Robert L. Huxol, Associate Superintendent, Department of Education
Minnesota:	Dr. Harvey Stegemoeller, Executive Director, Minnesota Private College Council
	Mr. Richard C. Hawk, Executive Director, Higher Education Coordinating Board
Mississippi:	Dr. Lewis Nobles, President, Mississippi College
	Dr. Charles Martin, Vice President, Mississippi College
	Dr. E. E. Thrash, Executive Secretary and Director, Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning
Missouri:	Mr. Charles V. Gallagher, Executive Director, Independent Colleges and Universities of Missouri
	Mr. Robert Hall, Associate Director of Academic Affairs, Coordinating Board for Higher Education
Montana:	Dr. Bruce Alton, President, Montana Independent Colleges, Inc.
	Dr. Lawrence K. Petit, Commissioner of Higher Education, Board of Regents for Higher Education

Nebraska:	Dr. Howard B. Dooley, Executive Director, Nebraska Association of Independent Colleges and Universities Dr. Kermit McMurray, Coordinator, Coordinating Council for Postsecondary Education
New Hampshire:	Dr. Lewis Vaccaro, President, Colby Sawyer College Dr. James Baselle, Executive Director, New Hampshire Postsecondary Education Commission
New Mexico:	Mr. Robert J. Koch, Executive Director, Council of Independent Colleges and Universities of New Mexico Dr. Robert Huff, Executive Secretary, Board of Educational Finance
New Jersey:	Dr. W. Noel Johnson, President, Association of Independent Colleges and Universities in New Jersey Dr. Matthew Quinn, Director of Office of Independent Colleges, Board of Higher Education
New York:	Dr. Howard B. Maxwell, Vice President for Administration, Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities Dr. T. Edward Hollander, Deputy Commissioner, Board of Regents, University of the State of New York
North Carolina:	Dr. Cameron P. West, President, North Carolina Association of Independent Colleges and Universities Dr. James Oliver, Director of Research, North Carolina Association of Independent Colleges and Universities Dr. Arnold King, Assistant to the President, University of North Carolina
North Dakota:	Mr. Fay Connell, Director of Development, Mary College Dr. Kenneth E. Raschke, Commissioner, Board of Higher Education
Ohio:	Dr. Frank E. Duddy, Jr., President, Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Ohio Dr. James A. Norton, Chancellor, Board of Regents

Oklahoma:	Mr. Edward C. Keefe, Executive Secretary, Oklahoma Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
	Dr. E. T. Dunlap, Chancellor, State Regents for Higher Education
	Dr. Dan Hobbs, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, State Regents for Higher Education
Oregon:	Dr. James Sullivan, Executive Director, Oregon Independent Colleges Association
	Dr. T. K. Olson, Executive Director, Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission
Pennsylvania:	Dr. Francis Michelini, President, Commission for Independent Colleges and Universities of Pennsylvania
	Dr. Harold Wiser, Assistant Commissioner, State Department of Education
Rhode Island:	Dr. Robert McKenna, Director of Community Relations, Salve Regina College
	Dr. Thomas C. Schmidt, Commissioner of Education, Board of Regents for Education
South Carolina:	Mr. J. Lacy McLean, Executive Vice President, South Carolina College Council
	Dr. Frank E. Kinard, Assistant Director for Programs and Research, Commission on Higher Education
South Dakota:	Mr. Peter Grossman, Director, South Dakota Association of Private Colleges
	Dr. Richard Bowen, Commissioner of Higher Education, State Regents of Education
Tennessee:	Dr. Wyles Ayers, President, Tennessee Council of Private Colleges
	Dr. G. Wayne Brown, Executiver Director, Tennessee Higher Education Commission
Texas:	Dr. Robert D. Hunter, Executive Vice President, Independent Colleges and Universities of Texas
	Dr. William Webb, Deputy Commissioner, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System
Utah:	Dr. Dallin Oaks, President, Brigham Young University
	Dr. Helmut Hoffman, President, Westminster College
	Dr. Leon McCarrey, Deputy Commissioner, State Board of Regents

Virginia:	Mr. Donald A. Holden, Executive Director, Council of Independent Colleges in Virginia
	Mr. Barry Dorsey, Coordinator of Planning, Special Programs and Special Projects, State Council of Higher Education
Washington:	Mr. David M. Irwin, Executive Vice President, Washington Friends of Higher Education
	Mr. Patrick M. Callan, Executive Coordinator, Council for Postsecondary Education
West Virginia:	Mr. Ray M. Joens, Executive Director, West Virginia Association of Private Colleges
	Dr. Ben L. Morton, Chancellor, West Virginia Board of Regents
Wisconsin:	Mr. Robert E. McCarthy, Executive Director, Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
	Dr. John C. Weaver, President, University of Wisconsin

APPENDIX B

Methods Used to Secure Private College Participation in State Agency Long Range Planning

Methods	Number of Agencies Indicating Use (n=24)
Ad Hoc-Consultative	
1. Respond to draft documents	11
2. Provide data and information upon request	7
3. Testify at public hearings or board meetings	7
4. Informal contact with staff members	7
Standing-Consultative	
1. Membership on advisory committee of private college representatives	12
2. Membership on general advisory committee to agency	12
3. Membership in voluntary association that participated in planning process	3
4. Membership on a 1202 Commission that participated in planning process	1
Ad Hoc-Substantive	
1. Membership on advisory group or task force responsible for development of the plan	14
2. Plan coordinating group membership	6
3. Consultants or staff associates for plan	2
Standing-Substantive	
1. Agency board membership	5

APPENDIX C

Methods Used to Secure Private College Participation in State Agency Reviews of New Programs in Public Colleges

Methods	Number of Agencies Indicating Use (n=22)
Ad Hoc-Consultative	
1. Program proposal circulated for comment	11
2. Opinions registered at board meetings and public hearings	3
Standing-Consultative	
1. Represented on a general advisory committee to agency	8
Ad Hoc-Substantive	
1. Represented on review team or committee	4
2. Represented on regional planning councils	2
3. Secure recommendations from voluntary associations conprised of public and private college representatives	1
Standing-Substantive	
1. Represented on agency	1

APPENDIX D

Methods Used to Secure Private College Participation in State Agency Reviews of Existing Programs in Public Colleges

Methods	Number of Agencies Indicating Use (n=8)
Ad Hoc-Consultative	
1. Contact with agency staff	1
2. Provide data and information upon request	1
Standing-Consultative	
1. Represented on a general advisory committee	3
Ad Hoc-Substantive	
1. Represented on review team or committee	2
2. Developed guidelines for or helped select consultants	2
Standing-Substantive	
1. Represented on agency	1

APPENDIX E

Methods Used to Secure Private College Participation in State Agency Reviews of New Programs in Private Colleges

Methods	Number of Agencies Indicating Use (n=9)
Ad Hoc-Consultative	
1. Direct contact with staff	6
2. Review program announcement and submit comments	4
3. Testify at board meetings or public hearings	2
Standing-Consultative	
1. Member of general advisory committee to agency	1
Ad Hoc-Substantive	
1. Member of review team or committee	3
2. Represented on regional planning councils	2
Standing-Substantive	
1. Agency membership	1

APPENDIX F

Methods Used to Secure Private College Participation in State Agency Reviews of Existing Programs in Private Colleges

Methods	Number of Agencies Indicating Use (n=5)
Ad Hoc-Consultative	
1. Contact with staff	4
Standing-Consultative	
1. Member of general advisory committee to agency	2
Ad Hoc-Substantive	
1. Member of review team or committee	2
2. Developed guidelines for and/or helped select consultants	2
Standing-Substantive	
1. Agency membership	1

APPENDIX G

States Where Private Colleges Participated in State Agency Long Range Planning and Program Reviews With An Indication of Kind of Participation

States	Long Range Planning	Pub. Col. New Prog. Reviews	Pub. Col. Existing Program Reviews	Pri. Col. New Prog. Reviews	Priv. Col. Existing Program Reviews
Alabama	Advisory	Formative	-	Formative	-
California	Voting	Voting	Voting	-	Voting
Colorado	Formative	Advisory	Advisory	-	-
Connecticut	Voting	Voting	-	-	-
Florida	-	-	Formative	-	Formative
Illinois	Formative	Reactive	-	-	-
Indiana	Formative	-	-	-	-
Iowa	-	Formative	-	-	-
Kentucky	Formative	-	-	-	-
Louisiana	Formative	Formative	Reactive	-	Reactive
Maryland	-	Advisory	Advisory	Advisory	-
Massachusetts	-	Voting	-	-	-
Minnesota	Formative	Formative	Formative	Formative	Formative
Mississippi	-	-	-	Reactive	-
Missouri	Formative	Reactive	-	-	-
New Hampshire	Voting	-	-	-	-
New Jersey	Voting	Voting	-	Voting	-
New York	Advisory	Reactive	Formative	Reactive	Formative
North Carolina	Advisory	-	-	-	-
Ohio	Advisory	Reactive	-	Reactive	-
Oklahoma	Formative	Advisory	-	-	-
Oregon	-	Reactive	-	Reactive	-
Pennsylvania	Formative	Formative	Formative	Formative	-
Rhode Island	Formative	Reactive	-	-	-
South Carolina	Formative	Advisory	-	-	-
Tennessee	Advisory	-	-	-	-
Utah	Formative	Reactive	-	-	-
Virginia	Advisory	Reactive	-	-	-
Washington	Voting	Reactive	-	-	-
West Virginia	Advisory	-	-	-	-

NOTE: Dash marks in the table as well as omitted states indicate that, at the time of the survey, the state agency was reportedly not conducting the activity (or activities) or was conducting the activity (or activities) without private college participation.

APPENDIX H

Satisfaction with the Procedure Utilized to Involve Private Higher Education in State Agency Reviews of Existing Programs in Public Colleges

Respondent Group	Agencies Delimited According to Private College Participation Classification				
	Reactive (n=1)	Advisory (n=2)	Formative (n=4)	Voting (n=1)	Total (n=8)
State Agency	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.88
Private College	4.00	2.00	3.75	3.00	3.25

Satisfaction Scale: 4 = completely; 3 = somewhat; 2 = not too; 1 = not at all

Satisfaction with the Procedure Utilized to Involve Private Higher Education in State Agency Reviews of New Programs in Private Colleges

Respondent Group	Agencies Delimited According to Private College Participation Classification				
	Reactive (n=3)	Advisory (n=1)	Formative (n=2)	Voting (n=1)	Total (n=7)
State Agency	3.33	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.57
Private College	3.00	2.00	3.50	3.00	3.00

Satisfaction Scale: 4 = completely; 3 = somewhat; 2 = not too; 1 = not at all

APPENDIX H

Satisfaction with the Procedure Used to Involve Private Higher Education in State Agency Reveiws of Existing Programs in Private Colleges

Respondent Group	Agencies Delimited According to Private College Participation Classification				
	Reactive (n=1)	Advisory (n=0)	Formative (n=3)	Voting (n=1)	Total (n=5)
State Agency	4.00	---	4.00	3.00	3.80
Private College	4.00	---	3.66	3.00	3.60

Satisfaction Scale: 4 = completely; 3 = somewhat; 2 = not too; 1 = not at all

APPENDIX I

State Data for Explanatory Variables

States	State Agency Type[1]	1202 Commission Designation[2]	Pri. Col. Liaison on Agency Staff?[3]	% of Colleges That are Private[4]	Tax Rev. Per Capita[5]	% of Tax Revenue Appro. to Higher Ed.[6]	% of College Enrollment in Private Institutions[7]	% of Resident Students in In-State Pri. Colleges[8]	Type of State Aid to Private Colleges[9]
Alabama	AC	SEP		39	383	20	12	68	SI
Arizona	GB	SEP		23	582	16	3	46	NONE
Arkansas	RC	AUG		45	384	13	14	65	SA
California	AC	SAME		47	762	13	9	75	SP, SA, FA
Colorado	RC	NO		31	587	13	9	31	SP
Connecticut	RC	SAME	Yes	52	689	6	37	66	GP, SP, SA, FA
Florida	GB	SEP		50	520	10	17	58	SI, SP, SA
Georgia	GB	SEP		50	477	11	18	58	SA
Hawaii	GB	AUG		25	767	13	7	53	NONE
Idaho	GB	SAME		33	479	16	20	42	SI, SP, SA
Illinois	RC	SAME	Yes	59	699	9	24	74	GP, SP, SA, FA, O
Indiana	RC	SAME		64	547	10	25	52	SA, O
Iowa	GB	SEP		62	590	12	31	60	SI, SP, SA
Kansas	GB	SEP		44	573	14	11	54	SI, SP, SA
Kentucky	RC	SEP		76	441	13	16	59	SA
Louisiana	RC	SAME		37	496	11	14	63	GP, SI, SA
Maine	GB	SEP		60	597	7	23	30	SP, SA
Maryland	AC	AUG		42	674	9	14	65	GP, SP, SA, FA
Massachusetts	RC	AUG	Yes	71	767	5	56	54	SI, SP, SA, FA
Michigan	AC	SAME		52	679	10	12	74	GP, SP, SA, FA
Minnesota	AC	SAME		53	696	9	20	62	GP,SI,SP,SA,FA,O
Mississippi	GB	SEP		40	425	16	10	81	SP
Missouri	RC	SAME		67	501	10	30	56	SA

States	State Agency Type[1]	1202 Commission Designation[2]	Pri. Col. Liaison on Agency Staff?[3]	% of Colleges That are Private[4]	Tax Rev. Per Capita[5]	% of Tax Revenue Appro. To Higher Ed.[6]	% of College Enrollment in Private Institutions[7]	% of Resident Students in In-State Pri. Colleges[8]	Type of State Aid to Private Colleges[9]
Montana	GB	AUG	Yes	25	587	11	10	67	SP, SA
Nebraska	RC	SEP		43	543	13	18	52	NONE
New Hampshire	AC	SAME		58	483	6	42	25	NONE
New Jersey	RC	AUG	Yes	53	683	6	23	78	GP, SP, SA, FA
New Mexico	RC	SAME	Yes	18	484	15	8	76	SP, SA
New York	RC	SAME	Yes	71	952	9	39	76	GP, SP, SA, FA,O
North Carolina	GB	NO		37	461	15	19	53	SI, SP, SA
North Dakota	GB	AUG		27	517	15	6	69	SP, SA
Ohio	RC	SAME		54	497	9	23	65	SI, SP, SA, FA
Oklahoma	RC	SAME		34	428	11	15	64	SA
Oregon	RC	SAME		51	570	14	11	45	GP, SA
Pennsylvania	RC	AUG	Yes	65	615	9	39	71	SI, SP, SA
Rhode Island	GB	AUG		77	606	8	50	45	SI, SP, SA
South Carolina	RC	AUG		44	422	19	19	67	SP, SA, FA, O
South Dakota	GB	SEP		59	519	10	28	54	SP, SA
Tennessee	RC	NO		66	424	10	23	42	SI, SP, SA
Texas	RC	SAME	Yes	38	467	15	13	75	SI, SA
Utah	GB	AUG	Yes	36	472	16	35	36	NONE
Virginia	RC	SAME	Yes	47	510	11	12	57	SP, SA, O
Washington	AC	SAME		30	622	14	11	65	SP, SA
West Virginia	GB	AUG		43	450	13	13	47	SA, O
Wisconsin	GB	NO		48	696	13	13	60	SI, SP, SA
TOTAL: All States				52	618	11	21	65	

NOTES: [1]The statewide higher education agency in each state was identified as one of the following types: Advisory Coordinating Board (AC); Regulatory Coordinating Board (RC); or Governing Board (GB).

[2]The agency designated to serve as the 1202 Commission for each was identified according to the following scheme:

SAME: the state agency was also the 1202 Commission
AUG: the 1202 Commission was the state agency with augmented membership
SEP: the 1202 Commission was an agency other than the state agency
NO: no 1202 Commission designated

[3]If the state agency had a staff person that was formally designated to serve as a private college liaison, a yes appears in this column.

[4]The percentage of all colleges and universities in each state that were private.

[5]Tax revenues per capita.

[6]Percentage of tax revenues appropriated to higher education.

[7]The percentage of college enrollment in each state in private institutions.

[8]Resident (in-state) students attending private colleges in a state as a percentage of total private college enrollment for that state.

[9]Types of state aid to private colleges are identified in the following manner:

GP: aid for general purposes
SI: aid to specific institutions (includes aid for specific programs at specific institutions)
SP: funds for specific programs
SA: student aid (grants or loans)
FA: facilities assistance
O: no aid programs

SOURCES: [1]The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, The States and Higher Education: A Proud Past and A Vital Future. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976), p. 90 and Telephone Survey Data.

[2]The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, The States and Higher Education: A Proud Past and A Vital Future. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976), p. 91.

[3]Telephone Survey Data.

[4]U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Education Division. National Center for Education Statistics. Education Directory: Colleges and Universities, 1975-76. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976), p. xxviii.

[5]"Fact File." Chronicle of Higher Education. 8 March 1976, p. 4.

[6]Ibid.

[7]"Fact File." Chronicle of Higher Education. 15 December 1975, p. 5.

[8]U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Education Division, National Center for Education Statistics, "Resident Degree-Credit Students in Institutions of Higher Education, By Residence Status and By State or Other Area, Fall, 1972." (Unpublished data).

[9]Education Commission of the States, Educational Opportunity: The States and Private Higher Education. Higher Education in the State Series, vol. 5, no. 3 (Denver, Col.: Education Commission of the States, 1976) pp. 121-148; The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, The States and Higher Education: A Proud Past and a Vital Future - Supplement. (Berkeley: Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1976), pp. 33-34.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. Public Aid to Private and Proprietary Institutions. A Policy Statement. Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1975.

Barak, R.J. and Berdahl, R.O. State-Level Academic Program Review in Higher Education. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1978. (ERIC, ED 158 638)

Berdahl, Robert O. The State of State Planning, Coordination and Governance. Issues in Higher Education, no. 9. Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Education Board, 1975.

_____. Statewide Coordination of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

Berdahl, Robert O., ed. Evaluating Statewide Boards. New Directions for Institutional Research, no. 5. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1975.

Berve, Nancy M. Survey of the Structure of State Coordinating or Governing Boards and Public Institutional and Multicampus Governing Boards of Postsecondary Education As of January 1, 1975. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1975.

Bowen, Howard R. and Minter, W. John. Private Higher Education: First Annual Report on Financial and Educational Trends in the Private Sector of American Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1975.

Carlson, Edgar M. "Statewide Coordination: The Private Ingredient." In Evaluating Statewide Boards. New Directions for Institutional Research Series, no. 5, pp. 97-109. Edited by Robert M. Berdahl. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Capitol and the Campus: State Responsibility for Postsecondary Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The States and Higher Education: A Proud Past and A Vital Future. The Carnegie Council Series. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass. 1976.

_____. The States and Higher Education: A Proud Past and A Vital Future - Supplement Berkeley, Calif.: Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1976.

Cheit, Earl F. The New Depression in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971.

_____. The New Depression in Higher Education - Two Years Later. Berkeley, Calif.: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973.

Chronister, J.L. et. al. Independent College and University Participation in Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities, 1978.

Education Commission of the States. Educational Opportunity: The States and Private Higher Education. A Policy Statement. Denver, Colo.: Education Commission of the States, 1975.

_____. Final Report and Recommendations: Task Force on State Policy and Independent Higher Education. Report no. 100. Denver, Colo.: Education Commission of the States, 1977.

_____. Task Force on Coordination, Governance and Structure of Postsecondary Education. Coordination or Chaos. Report Number 43. Denver, Colo.: Education Commission of the States, 1973.

"Fact File." Chronicle of Higher Education, 8 March 1976, p. 4.

"Fact File." Chronicle of Higher Education, 15 December 1975, p. 5.

Folger, John K. "Building Public Support for Private Higher Education." Compact 10 (Summer 1976): 5-9.

Glenny, Lyman A. "Coordination and Planning Despite Competition and Confusion." In Assuring Academic Progress Without Growth. New Directions for Institutional Research Series, no. 6, pp. 13-22. Edited by Allan Cartter. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Illinois Board of Higher Education, Non Public Advisory Committee. "Non-Public Higher Education in Illinois: A Report for Master Plan - Phase IV." August, 1975.

Jellema, William W. From Red to Black. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Jenny, Hans H. and Wynn, G. Richard. The Golden Years: A Study of Income and Expenditure Growth and Distribution of 48 Private Liberal Arts Colleges, 1960-1968. Wooster, Ohio: The College of Wooster, 1970.

_____. The Turning Point: A Study of Income and Expenditure Growth and Distribution of 48 Private Four-Year Liberal Arts Colleges, 1960-1970. Wooster, Ohio: The College of Wooster. 1972.

Johnson, Elizabeth H. "Role of Statewide Boards in Program Review." In Current Issues in Higher Education, 1975. Learner Centered Reform. pp. 37-50. Edited by Dyckman Vermilye. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Jonsen, Richard W. State Policy and Independent Higher Education. Toledo, Ohio: The Center for the Study of Higher Education, The University of Toledo, 1975.

Lyddy, James P. "Statewide Planning and the Private Sector." Planning for Higher Education 4(April 1975): 1-5.

McCain, Nina. "Public-Private Clash in Massachusetts." Change 5 (May 1973): 16-19.

Millard, Richard M. State Boards of Higher Education. ERIC/Higher Education Research Report, no. 4. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1976.

_____. The States and Private Higher Education. Higher Education in the States Series, vol. 4, no. 1. Denver, Colo.: Education Commission of the States, 1975.

Millet, John D. "State Coordinating Boards and Statewide Governing Boards." In Evaluating Statewide Boards. New Directions for Institutional Research Series, no. 5, pp. 61-70. Edited by Robert M. Berdahl. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Mingle, J.R. "Influencing Academic Outcomes: The Power and Impact of Statewide Program Review." In The Closing System of Academic Employment. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1978.

Peterson, Robert G. "Environmental and Political Determinants of State Higher Education Appropriations Policies." Journal of Higher Education, 47 (September-October 1976): 523-542.

Pfnister, Allan O. "Developing Relationships Between Public and Private Higher Education." In New Directions in Statewide Higher Education Planning and Coordination: Proceedings of the 19th SREB Legislative Work Conference, pp 38-47. Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Education Board, (1970).

Scully, Malcolm G. "Public, Private Colleges in Open Conflict Over Support." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 22 November 1976, p. 1.

Southern Regional Education Board. Planning for Statewide Program Approval and Review. Issues in Higher Education, no. 11. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1977.

State Postsecondary Education Profiles Handbook. Denver, Colo.: Education Commission of the States, 1976.

Task Force of the National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities. A National Policy for Private Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1974.

U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare. Education Division. National Center for Education Statistics. Education Directory: Colleges and Universities, 1975-76. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976.

_____. "Resident Degree-Credit Students in Institutions of Higher Education, by Residence Status and by State of Other Area, Fall, 1972." (Unpublished Data.)

Wynn, G. Richard. At the Crossroads. A Report on the Financial Condition of the Forty-Eight Liberal Arts Colleges Previously Studied in: The Golden Years, The Turning Point. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Center for the Study of Higher Education, School of Education, The University of Michigan, 1974.